



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,424	08/27/2003	Chun Ho Cheung	MS1-1503US	5193
22801 7590 02/27/2007 LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER BECKER, SHASHI KAMALA	
			ART UNIT 2179	PAPER NUMBER

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/27/2007	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 02/27/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/649,424	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHEUNG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Shashi K. Becker	<b>Art Unit</b> 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                        |                                                                   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/14/03</u> .                                                | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The claimed limitation, "second wizard" is not described in the specification.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 2179

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li, US Patent 7089500, in view of Hekmatpour, US Patent 5822745.

- In regards to claims 1 and 11, Li teaches a method, apparatus and computer-readable medium for presenting a sequence of user interface pages to a user, comprising: page logic associated with an initial user interface page, wherein the page logic is configured to: detect the user's activation of a control provided by the initial user interface page (column 5 lines 14-25); and form a token representative of the activation of the control; and a navigation module which is configured to: receive the token from the page logic; and determine another user interface page to present to the user by traversing interface pages based on a navigation instruction specified by the token (column 5 lines 26-51). However, Li does not specifically teach a navigation module providing a hierarchical tree of nodes representative of the user interface pages in sequence, and traversing the hierarchical tree of nodes based on navigation instruction. Hekmatpour teaches an expert system and method employing hierarchical knowledge base, and interactive multimedia/hypermedia applications. Hekmatpour further teaches a navigation module providing a hierarchical tree of nodes representative of the user interface pages in sequence, and traversing the hierarchical tree of nodes based on navigation instruction (column 4 lines 55-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the method and apparatus of Li to include the teachings of Hekmatpour in order to traverse through a hierarchical tree of nodes. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to be able to traverse through a hierarchy of interface pages in a tree by a certain order.

- In regards to claims 2 and 12, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*). Li further teaches wherein the control is configured to instruct the apparatus to advance to a next user interface page in the sequence of user interface pages (column 5 lines 26-51).
- In regards to claims 3 and 13, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*). Li further teaches wherein the control is configured to instruct the apparatus to advance to a prior user interface page in the sequence of user interface pages (column 5 lines 26-51).
- In regards to claims 4 and 14, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*). Li further teaches, wherein the navigation module further includes history stack logic configured to record the prior user interface page to provide an indication of the prior user interface page upon activation of the control (column 10 lines 56-65).
- In regards to claims 5 and 15, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*). However, Li does not specifically teach, wherein the control is configured to instruct the apparatus to advance to one of a plurality of interface pages associated with different respective branching options.

Hekmatpour teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*).

Hekmatpour further teaches wherein the control is configured to instruct the apparatus to advance to one of a plurality of interface pages associated with different respective branching options (column 13 lines 35-50 and Figure 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Li to include the teachings of Hekmatpour in order for the apparatus to have different branching options. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order for the user to be able to pick in what order to view the interface pages based on the different branching options.

- In regards to claims 6 and 16, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*). However, Li does not specifically teach, wherein the hierarchical tree includes at least one collection node that includes plural children nodes said at least one collection node and plural children nodes defining a collection of nodes representative of a grouping of user interface pages within the sequence of user interface pages.

Hekmatpour teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*).

Hekmatpour further teaches wherein the hierarchical tree includes at least one collection node that includes plural children nodes said at least one collection node and plural children nodes defining a collection of nodes representative of a grouping of user interface pages within the sequence of user interface pages

(column 13 lines 35-50 and Figure 7). It would have been obvious for the reasons stated above (see claims 1 and 11).

- In regards to claim 7, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*). However, Li does not specifically teach wherein a behavior of said at least one collection node is governed by a strategy applied to said at least one collection node.

Hekmatpour teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*).

Hekmatpour further teaches wherein a behavior of said at least one collection node is governed by a strategy applied to said at least one collection node (column 13 lines 35-50 and Figure 7). It would have been obvious for the reasons stated above (see claims 1 and 11).

- In regards to claims 8 and 17, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*). However, Li does not specifically teach, wherein the strategy is dynamically applied to said at least one collection node.

Hekmatpour teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*).

Hekmatpour further teaches wherein the strategy is dynamically applied to said at least one collection node (column 23 lines 45-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Li to include the teachings of Hekmatpour in order to have the strategy dynamically applied. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to traverse through hierarchal nodes with a strategy dynamically applied.

- In regards to claims 9 and 18, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*). However, Li does not specifically teach, wherein the strategy defines whether said at least one collection node exhibits a branching behavior or a non-branching behavior.

Hekmatpour teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*).

Hekmatpour further teaches wherein the strategy defines whether said at least one collection node exhibits a branching behavior or a non-branching behavior (column 13 lines 35-50 and Figure 7). It would have been obvious for the reasons stated above (see claims 5 and 15 *supra*).

- In regards to claim 10, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*). Li further teaches a computer readable medium including machine-readable instructions for implementing the page logic and the navigation module (column 2 lines 42-52).
- In regards to claim 19, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*). Li further teaches, wherein the sequence of user interface pages defines a first wizard, and wherein the method further comprises providing another sequence of user interface pages that defines a second wizard, wherein the first and second wizards share at least one user interface page in common (column 5 lines 14-51).
- In regards to claim 20, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*). Li further teaches a computer readable medium having machine-



readable instructions for implementing each of the detecting, forming, sending, receiving, and traversing (column 5 lines 14-51).

- In regards to claim 21, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*). However, Li does not specifically teach a hierarchical tree having nodes that represent a sequence of user interface pages in a wizard, including: at least one collection node that defines a collection of user interface pages within the sequence of user interface pages, wherein a behavior of said at least one collection node is defined by a strategy applied to said at least one collection node; and at least one page node that directly represents a corresponding user interface page.

Hekmatpour teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*).

Hekmatpour further teaches a hierarchical tree having nodes that represent a sequence of user interface pages in a wizard, including: at least one collection node that defines a collection of user interface pages within the sequence of user interface pages (column 4 lines 55-67), wherein a behavior of said at least one collection node is defined by a strategy applied to said at least one collection node; and at least one page node that directly represents a corresponding user interface page (column 13 lines 35-50). It would have been obvious for the reasons stated above (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*).

- In regards to claim 22, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*). However, Li does not specifically teach, wherein the strategy applied

to said at least one collection node creates non-branching behavior in the collection of user interface pages.

Hekmatpour teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*).

Hekmatpour further teaches wherein the strategy applied to said at least one collection node creates non-branching behavior in the collection of user interface pages (column 13 lines 35-50 and Figure 7). It would have been obvious for the reasons stated above (see claims 5 and 15 *supra*).

- In regards to claim 23, Li teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*). However, Li does not specifically teach, wherein the strategy applied to said at least one collection node creates branching behavior in the collection of user interface pages.

Hekmatpour teaches the above limitations (see claims 1 and 11 *supra*).

Hekmatpour further teaches wherein the strategy applied to said at least one collection node creates branching behavior in the collection of user interface pages (column 13 lines 35-50 and Figure 7). It would have been obvious for the reasons stated above (see claims 5 and 15 *supra*).

### **Conclusion**

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Lyness, US 6496842, teaches navigating hierarchically organized information. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shashi K. Becker whose telephone number is 571-272-8919. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SKB

  
BATHUYNH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER